



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

institutions—schools and colleges—and the work done in them, since he holds that “the history of education is not coincident, point for point, with the history of opinions concerning what education ought to be.” For the earlier centuries the history is admittedly (and at present almost necessarily) based on the researches of the late A. F. Leach; though Professor Adamson does not follow all the deductions which that writer was wont so truculently to preach. There is, however, a useful chapter on the education of chivalry, which trained the many who were not of the scholarly type. But on the whole the account of medieval education is the least satisfactory section; the truth indeed being that far more research is necessary before that history can be adequately written. The account of Humanism, of the New Philosophy and its educational developments (in which, as might be expected from Professor Adamson, Ratke is not even mentioned), and of the eighteenth century, are all excellent. The drab story of the nineteenth century is told as lucidly as may be; though it seems a pity that the continuation of that story should end at 1903. The value and interest of the book are increased by contemporary descriptions of education in various centuries, e. g., those of John of Salisbury and John Wallis, and of works of traditional importance, such as the *Doctrinale* of Alexander de Villa Dei. Altogether it is the soundest text-book on its subject that has yet appeared.

F. A. CAVENAGH.

A HISTORY OF THE CONCEPTIONS OF LIMITS AND FLUXIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN FROM NEWTON TO WOODHOUSE. By *Florian Cajori*. London: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1919. Pp. 293 + vii contents + 6 index. Price, 7s. 6d.

Everybody who is interested in the fundamentals of the Calculus should read this ably written little book. Starting with the works of Newton that contain mention of fluxions, we are led, through a chapter on printed books and articles on the subject which were published before 1734, to the controversy between Berkeley on the one side and Jurin and Walton on the other. Then we have the controversy, Robins and Pemberton versus Jurin, which really produced valuable results; these, leading immediately to several texts on fluxions, ultimately caused the production of Maclaurin's Treatise of 1742. We are then given a bibliography of books published between 1745 and 1761, with extracts and short discussions; of these Professor Cajori remarks that only two were of any real interest, namely, those of Simpson and Emerson. These two works lead to a controversy between Robert Heath and others as partizans of Emerson and John Turner and others as partizans of Simpson; this controversy had little to commend it. The final chapters deal with abortive attempts at arithmetization, later books and articles on fluxions, and criticisms by British writers; a summary of the whole by the author, under the chapter-heading “Merits and Defects,” closes a most interesting volume.

There is but one matter for adverse comment: this occurs on page 36, where Professor Cajori founds an argument on the occurrence of the words “at the very *instant*,” taken from the translation by Thorp of the Latin of

Newton, without noticing that here is nothing of the sort in the Latin, which is given on page 6. It is Thorp's idea that is thus criticized and not Newton's; for Newton's words are, "*sed tunc cum attingit*," which should have been translated by some such logical phrase as, "but at the *then* when it reaches (this position)." Thus, no matter what the manner may be in which Newton *made use* of fluxions, *he* originally *defined* a fluxion by a *Schnitt*, without infinitesimals.

J. M. CHILD.